REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are present in the above-captioned application and have been subjected to restriction under 35 U.S.C. δ 121 as follows:

Group I: Claims 1-27 drawn to an intraluminal medical device; and

Group II: Claims 28-31 drawn to a method of manufacturing a medical device.

The restriction requirement is traversed. The fact that the Patent Office classifies Claims 1-27 and Claims 28-31 in different parts of its classification system does not show that these two groups of claims have been acquired a separate status in the art. The classification system developed by the Patent Office has over 100,000 different categories and is intended to help Examiners and other individuals find references relatively quickly, not to show whether particular subjects are considered to be separate by those in the art. The classification system of the Patent Office is constantly being changed, clearly showing that it is not a good basis for making a permanent decision about whether two groups of claims should be divided among two separate patent applications.

Hence, it is respectfully urged that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement for restriction and provide an action on the merits with respect to all of the claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Carl J. Evens
Reg. No. 33,874
Attorney for Applicants

Johnson& Johnson
One Johnson& Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-2518